

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 5 and 11 are independent claims.

In view of the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,617,802 issued to Roh ("Roh"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection improper.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Roh fails to teach every limitation of claim 1, claim 5, and claim 11. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a current path for generating the falling ramp waveform includes the main path switch and the second switch, the second switch being a sustain unit switch." Claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, a "turning on the main path switch forms a current path including the main path switch and the second voltage, and generates a falling ramp waveform in the scan electrode, the second voltage being a sustain unit voltage." Claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, "a current path for generating the falling ramp waveform includes the main path switch and the second switch, the second switch being a sustain unit switch."

The examiner asserts that Roh teaches these features. Specifically, the examiner asserts that Roh's current path for generating a falling ramp waveform includes Yfr, and that "Yfr can be called a sustain unit switch since it is part of the scan electrode drive board 100, which

contains the sustain, reset and scan units." See Office Action, page 4, lines 14-15 (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully disagrees and believes that the examiner's characterization of Yfr fails to lend weight to the wording recited in Applicant's claims. Under the examiner's erroneous interpretation of "sustain unit switch," every switch in a scan electrode drive board 100 can be a sustain unit switch. This interpretation erroneously fails to consider the design characteristics unique to the various types of switches in a drive board. See, e.g., Specification, page 4, lines 16-20 (teaching that sustain switches are designed to have "a large capacity for storing a large current used during the sustain period and each is driven at a low voltage.").

Applicant asserts that Roh does not disclose every limitation of claims 1, 5 and 11. Rather, in Roh, a current path for generating the falling ramp waveform in a scan electrode includes a separating switch (Yp), a ramp waveform generator switch (Yfr), and a ground terminal in Roh's ramp waveform generation circuit, all of which are distinct and separate from the sustain switches and voltages in the sustain unit. Roh's sustain switches, labeled Y SUSTAIN SWITCHES, are shown as including only Sy1 and Sy2 in Roh's Fig. 5. This is supported by Roh's specification, wherein Sy1 and Sy2 are described as "Y-electrode sustain switches." Roh, col. 5, line 13. To the contrary, Yfr, a switch in Roh's RAMP WAVEFORM GENERATOR & SEPARATING SWITCH in Roh's Fig. 5, is described as a component of a "Y-electrode ramp waveform generation circuit." Roh, col. 5, lines 17-18. Thus, Roh's falling ramp waveform current path does not include any of Roh's sustain switches or sustain voltages.

Accordingly, Roh does not disclose at least these elements of this application's independent claims: "a current path for generating the falling ramp waveform includes the main path switch and the second switch, the second switch being a sustain unit switch," or "turning on the main path switch forms a current path including the main path switch and the second voltage, and generates a falling ramp waveform in the scan electrode, the second voltage being a sustain unit voltage."

Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that Roh fails to teach the main path switch claimed in the present application. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “a main path switch ... for generating a falling ramp waveform which is a portion of a reset waveform.” Claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, a “wherein turning on the main path switch ... generates a falling ramp waveform in the scan electrode.” Claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, “a main path switch ... for generating a falling ramp waveform which is a portion of a reset waveform.” The examiner asserts that Yp alone teaches the main path switch because “Yp also helps generate the falling ramp waveform.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 1 and 11 recite that the main path switch is for generating a falling ramp waveform. Claim 5 recites that the main path switch generates a falling ramp waveform. It is clear from Roh's Fig. 5 that Yfr, which is connected to the ramp waveform generator “ramp,” is the switch that generates the falling ramp waveform. Therefore, because Yp does not generate a falling ramp waveform, Yp alone cannot anticipate the main path switch as claimed in claims 1, 5 and 11. Further, the examiner agreed with this position in page 2 of the Office Action mailed January 10, 2006 (wherein the examiner relied upon both Yp and Yfr to teach the present application's main path switch, and stated “switches Yp and Yfr function together as the main path switch”). For at least this reason as well, Roh fails to teach every limitation of claims 1, 5 and 11.

Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 5 and 11, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-11.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: August 18, 2006

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/WMH/alj